

**From:** [Angela Carpenter](#)  
**To:** [Arlene Anderson](#)  
**Cc:** [Denise Zeno](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Cabo Rojo Results - Feb 27-Mar 1sampling  
**Date:** 03/13/2012 08:45 AM

---

Unfortunately I have the Remedy Review Board tomorrow (it's more or less an all day thing) so I can't meet. I've spoken to Joe this morning as well as HQ about the numbers found in the letter health consult (that CREG value). They'll get back to us but their position is that we should use the new perc numbers for determining actionable levels.

▼ Arlene Anderson---03/13/2012 07:32:09 AM---Angela, I am in NYC tomorrow for several meetings. Denise and I planned on review logistical items.

From: Arlene Anderson/R2/USEPA/US  
To: Angela Carpenter/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, "Denise Zeno"  
<Zeno.Denise@epamail.epa.gov>  
Date: 03/13/2012 07:32 AM  
Subject: Re: Cabo Rojo Results - Feb 27-Mar 1sampling

---

Angela,

I am in NYC tomorrow for several meetings. Denise and I planned on review logistical items, fact sheets, etc... Should Denise, Me, you and I meet to?

The one I see removal eligible is the print shop indoor. But not sure if we should pay since we have two PRPs(property and business owner). As to their ability to pay- not sure.

Arlene anderson

▼ Angela Carpenter

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Angela Carpenter  
**Sent:** 03/12/2012 07:23 PM EDT  
**To:** Denise Zeno; Rebecca Ofrane  
**Cc:** Mel Hauptman; Michael Moltzen; Michael Sivak; Arlene Anderson; Charles Nace  
**Subject:** Re: Cabo Rojo Results - Feb 27-Mar 1sampling

I haven't had a chance to review but are these removal eligible.

▼ Denise Zeno

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Denise Zeno  
**Sent:** 03/12/2012 06:14 PM EDT  
**To:** Rebecca Ofrane  
**Cc:** Angela Carpenter; Mel Hauptman; Michael Moltzen; Michael Sivak; Arlene Anderson; Charles Nace  
**Subject:** Cabo Rojo Results - Feb 27-Mar 1sampling

We need to know if based on your review of the preliminary data, we have to take action at the pre-school. are the numbers high enough that we have to put in place a vapor mitigation system or not? are the kids exposed? what measures do we need to take to minimize

exposure, if any?

based on your experience with other sites, how is ATSDR going to interpret this data? We'll release the data to ATSDR as soon as it gets validated.

We are going back to the field next week. I still have to talk with the NY Regional Headstart Director, AFC from the Human Health Service Agency. They also need to know if the kids are at risk and what are we going to do about it.

please help!

thanks

Denise Zeno  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
290 Broadway  
New York, NY 10007  
Tel: 212.637.4319  
Fax: 212.637.3083

▼ Charles Nace---03/12/2012 03:48:50 PM---Becky, There was indoor air data for EQP/Headstart (see summary below).

From: Charles Nace/R2/USEPA/US  
To: Rebecca Ofrane/R2/USEPA/US@EPA  
Cc: Angela Carpenter/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Denise Zeno/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Mel Hauptman/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Michael Moltzen/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Michael Sivak/R2/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 03/12/2012 03:48 PM  
Subject: Re: Fw: Cabo Rojo - SUMMA canister prelims

---

Becky,

There was indoor air data for EQP/Headstart (see summary below).

Building EQP - This building had elevated concentrations of PCE, TCE, and DCE in the subslab during the initial sampling round. The indoor air results from this building indicate that TCE and DCE were all below the detection limits. PCE was detected in six locations (EQP-IA1, EQP-IA2, EQP-IA3, EQP-IA6, EQP-IA7, and EQP-IA8) of the nine sampled locations and in one of the ambient samples (EQP-AMB3). All of the detected concentrations were above the ATSDR screening value of 0.2 ug/m3, but below their chronic value of 300 ug/m3. EPA also has indoor air screening values of 9.4 ug/m3, which represents a 10-6 cancer risk, and 940 ug/m3, which represents a 10-4 cancer risk. In addition, we have a non-cancer screening value of 41 ug/m3. Three of the samples exceeded the EPA 10-6 screening value and none of the samples exceeded the 10-4 screening value (see attached file). One of the samples EQP-IA8 exceeds the non-cancer screening value of 41 ug/m3 (47.5 ug/m3). There were several other compounds that exceeded screening values: 1,4-dichlorobenzene, benzene, carbon tetrachloride, chloroform, ethylbenzene, and methylene chloride. Of these compounds only 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene,

chloroform and methylene chloride exceeded a hazard index of 1 or the 10-4 screening value. I only had subslab results for PCE, TCE, and DCE, so I was unable to determine if the other compounds that were detected are site-related or if they are associated with an indoor source.

Chuck



▼ Rebecca Ofrane---03/12/2012 03:43:39 PM---Denise, Here is a summary based on these Summa canister results.

From: Rebecca Ofrane/R2/USEPA/US  
To: Denise Zeno/R2/USEPA/US@EPA  
Cc: Angela Carpenter/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Charles Nace/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Mel Hauptman/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Michael Sivak/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Michael Moltzen/R2/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 03/12/2012 03:43 PM  
Subject: Re: Fw: Cabo Rojo - SUMMA canister prelims

---

Denise,  
Here is a summary based on these Summa canister results.

**Building S2** had 6 subslab and 2 indoor air samples. Two SS samples had exceedances of TCE and PCE over EPA's screening values, for both cancer and noncancer. However, the indoor air samples had very low detections, with PCE exceeding ATSDR's screening level of 0.2 ug/m3 in one of them by an order of magnitude. Other SS locations had low detections of PCE. The VI Pathway here appears to be incomplete, but SS levels indicate justification for ongoing sampling.

**Building DEC** had 5 SS, 3 indoor, and 1 ambient sample. One SS sample exceeded screening values for PCE, but none was detected in indoor air. Other SS locations had low detections of PCE, and one had a low detection of TCE. The VI pathway here appears to be incomplete.

**Building CRPDC** had 3 SS, 2 indoor air, and 1 ambient sample. All three SS samples exceeded EPA's screening values for PCE and TCE. The PCE exceeded the 10-4 screening level (9,400 ug/m3), ranging from 104,000 to 692,000 ug/m3. Indoor air samples had only low detections of PCE, lower than ambient air. It appears that ventilation systems are adequate here, though sampling should continue based on SS levels.

**Building EQP/Headstart** had 10 SS samples, no indoor air. 9 of the 10 samples had exceedances of PCE over EPA's 10-6 screening level, with one sample location over the 10-4 screening level. TCE also had exceedances, as well as other low levels of VOCs. Also, SS10 had a low detection of PCE that did not exceed screening levels, but Toluene at this location was detected at 131,000 ug/m3. As the VI pathway here is suspected to be complete based on previous sampling, indoor air samples should be confirmed as soon as possible, and EPA should be

prepared to take action and install mitigation systems if necessary.

Please let me know if you'd like to discuss or if you have any questions. As Chuck mentioned in his previous assessment, Michael and Angela should weigh in on the results to ensure consistency.

Thanks,  
Becky Ofrane  
U.S. EPA Region 2 | Superfund Risk Assessment  
(212) 637 4302  
ofrane.rebecca@epa.gov

-----Denise Zeno/R2/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Rebecca Ofrane/R2/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: Denise Zeno/R2/USEPA/US  
Date: 03/09/2012 04:07PM  
Cc: Charles Nace/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Michael  
Sivak/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Angela Carpenter/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Mel  
Hauptman/R2/USEPA/US@EPA  
Subject: Fw: Cabo Rojo - SUMMA cansister prelims

figures will follow in separate email

-----Forwarded by Denise Zeno/R2/USEPA/US on  
03/09/2012 04:06PM -----

=====  
To: Arlene Anderson/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Denise  
Zeno/R2/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: "Cartwright, Michael W"  
<michael.w.cartwright@lmco.com>  
Date: 03/09/2012 01:00PM  
Cc: Jeff Catanzarita/ERT/R2/USEPA/US@EPA  
Subject: Cabo Rojo - SUMMA cansister prelims  
=====

Arlene and Denise,  
Attached are the rest of the SUMMA canister prelims  
for the Cabo Rojo site. Please let me know if you  
haven't received copies of the maps for this  
sampling event, and I will provide you with them.  
Thanks,  
Mike

Michael W. Cartwright  
Lockheed Martin - SERAS  
2890 Woodbridge Ave.  
Edison, NJ 08837  
732.321.4284

-----Original Message-----

From: Beauchaine, Benjamin P  
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2012 11:15 AM  
To: catanzarita.jeff@epa.gov; Cartwright, Michael W

Cc: Depasquale, Geraldine M; Kansal, Vinod C;  
Killeen, Deborah A; Miller, Dennis A; Raj Singhvi  
Subject: Emailing: SERAS-130-DLP-030912.xlsx, WA#0-  
130 Cabo Rojo TO-15 Prelims 34 Airs 030912.PDF

Preliminary results for the TO-15 analysis of 34  
air samples received from the Cabo Rojo Site (WA#  
0-130) on 03/05/12.

Ben Beauchaine  
Chemist Senior

Lab: (732) 321-4394  
Office: (732) 494-4006  
Cell: (714) 417-7628

Your message is ready to be sent with the following  
file or link attachments:

SERAS-130-DLP-030912.xlsx  
WA#0-130 Cabo Rojo TO-15 Prelims 34 Airs 030912.PDF

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail  
programs may prevent sending or receiving certain  
types of file attachments. Check your e-mail  
security settings to determine how attachments are  
handled.

[attachment "SERAS-130-DLP-030912.xlsx" removed by Rebecca  
Ofrane/R2/USEPA/US]  
[attachment "WA#0-130 Cabo Rojo TO-15 Prelims 34 Airs 030912.PDF"  
removed by Rebecca Ofrane/R2/USEPA/US][attachment "Cabo 0312 VI  
sampling.docx" deleted by Charles Nace/R2/USEPA/US]